

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Attached hereto are replacement figure sheets for Figures 1A, 1B, and 4, which include the changes, without markings, identified below.

Figure 1A has been labeled as "Prior Art."

Figure 1B has been labeled as "Prior Art."

Figure 2 has been amended to include an arrow from Automatic Power Controller 330 to Image Data Corrector 320, and to exclude Address Data Generator 200 from inside the Controller 300 block.

Figure 4 has been amended to include reference numeral 323 APC Interval Discriminator, to delete reference numeral 324, and to modify reference numeral 322 to properly label memory.

REMARKS

The claims have not been amended. The specification, including the figures identified above, has been amended to correct certain informalities. Accordingly, claims 1-10 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 4, and 7 are independent claims.

The above amendments do not add new matter to the application and are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments may be found at least at paragraphs [0026], [0028], [0030], and [0036] of the specification.

In view of the above amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Drawing Objection

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to for failing to designate Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B as Prior Art. Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B have been labeled as Prior Art by this amendment. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0190925 filed by Awamoto, *et al.* ("Awamoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection improper.

Applicant submits that Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 1. Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

selecting a correction table from a memory according to ...
the automatic power control level.

Awamoto fails to disclose at least these features. The examiner asserts that Awamoto discloses "selecting a correction table from a memory according to ... the automatic power control level" at Awamoto's paragraph [0028], lines 15-18 and 24-25 on the right column of page 2. Applicant disagrees. While the cited portions of paragraph [0028] disclose calculating a "display load factor ... used for an automatic power control," Awamoto fails to disclose that "a correction table from a memory" is selected "according to ... the automatic power control level."

This position is supported by Awamoto's paragraph [0030], which discloses "table memories 811 and 812" in the data conversion circuit 73, but makes no reference to an automatic power control level. Rather, the display load factor is calculated by display load factor detection circuit 75, and is "used for an automatic power control (APC) performed by the controller 71." Awamoto's paragraph [0028], lines 19-21, 24-25 on the right column of page 2. Further, as shown in Awamoto's Fig. 2, data conversion circuit 73 sends the data Dsf to A-driver 69 and controller 71 also sends data to the A-driver 69. However, no data is transferred between data conversion circuit 73 and controller 71. Thus, the data conversion circuit 73 does not select a table memory "according to" the APC performed by the controller 71.

Accordingly, neither paragraph [0028], paragraph [0030], Fig. 2, nor any other portion of Awamoto discloses at least these features of claim 1.

Applicant also submits that Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 4. Claim 4 recites, *inter alia*:

an automatic power controller generating ... the number of
subfields corresponding to the load factor;
a subfield generator for generating subfield data
corresponding to each image data for each of the number of
subfields output from the automatic power controller; and

an image data corrector for receiving the number of subfields fed back from the automatic power controller, correcting image data with reference to a correction table corresponding to the number of subfields, and outputting the corrected image data to the automatic power controller. (emphasis added)

Awamoto fails to disclose at least these features. The examiner asserts that Awamoto discloses “an automatic power controller generating ... the number of subfields corresponding to the load factor” at Awamoto’s paragraph [00218] (sic), lines 1-25 on the right column of page 2. Applicant disagrees. The cited portions of paragraph [0028] are directed to the conversion of frame data Df into subframe data Dsf, the potentials applied to the plasma display panel electrodes in either a progressive or interlaced scanning driving method, and the calculation of a display load factor for use in an automatic power control. However, no portion of Awamoto discloses “an automatic power controller generating ... the number of subfields.” Rather, as asserted above, the generation of subfield data Dsf is performed independently of the performance of the APC by the controller 71. Thus, Awamoto fails to disclose “an automatic power controller generating ... the number of subfields corresponding to the load factor.”

Additionally, since Awamoto fails to disclose “an automatic power controller generating ... the number of subfields corresponding to the load factor,” Awamoto also fails to disclose a “subfield generator for generating subfield data corresponding to each image data for each of the number of subfields output from the automatic power controller” (emphasis added). The examiner again looks to Awamoto’s paragraph [00218] (sic), lines 1-25 on the right column of page 2 to disclose these features. However, as asserted above and as shown in Fig. 2, Awamoto’s controller 71, which performs the APC, does not output a “number of subfields.” Thus, even assuming Awamoto discloses a subfield generator, Awamoto’s subfield generator fails to disclose “generating subfield data ... for each of the number of subfields output from the automatic power controller.”

Similarly, for at least the reasons asserted above, Awamoto fails to disclose “an image data corrector for receiving the number of subfields fed back from the automatic power controller, correcting image data with reference to a correction table corresponding to the number of subfields, and outputting the corrected image data to the automatic power controller” (emphasis added). As asserted above and as shown in Fig. 2, Awamoto’s controller 71, which performs the APC, does not feed back a “number of subfields,” and “corrected image data” is not output to the controller 71.

Applicant further submits that Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 7. Claim 7 recites, *inter alia*:

a controller for calculating a load factor of externally input video signals, generating sustain pulse information and a number of subfields corresponding to the load factor, and selecting a correction table corresponding to the number of subfields to output corrected video signals data. (emphasis added)

Awamoto fails to disclose at least these features. Here, the examiner asserts that Awamoto discloses “a controller for calculating a load factor of externally input video signals, generating sustain pulse information and a number of subfields corresponding to the load factor” at Awamoto’s paragraph [0028], lines 1-10 and 19-25 on the right column of page 2. Applicant disagrees. As asserted above, the generation of subfield data Dsf in Awamoto is performed independently of the performance of the APC by the controller 71.

Moreover, as asserted above, table memories are stored in data conversion circuit 73, which generates subframe data Dsf. Thus, controller 71 cannot anticipate the “controller” recited in claim 7, which is for “calculating a load factor of externally input video signals, generating sustain pulse information and a number of subfields corresponding to the load factor, and selecting a correction table corresponding to the number of subfields” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 7.

For at least these reasons, Awamoto fails to disclose every feature of claim 1, claim 4, and claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 4, and 7. Claims 2-3, 5-6, and 8-10 depend from claims 1, 4, and 7, and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 4, and 7, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: December 29, 2006

Customer No. 58027
H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/WMH/alj